

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA  
NORTHERN DIVISION

DANIEL ARMENDARIZ,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	CASE NO. 2:19-CV-1046-MHT-CSC
	)	
COMMISSIONER DUNN, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**ORDER ON MOTION**

Upon consideration of Plaintiff's Motion for Pretrial Hearing and as no trial has been set in this matter, it is

ORDERED that the motion (Doc. 173) is DENIED.

Before the Court is Plaintiff's renewed Motion to Appoint Counsel and brief in support thereof. A plaintiff in a civil case has no constitutional right to counsel. An indigent plaintiff may be appointed counsel pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1), but a court retains broad discretion in making this decision. *See Killian v. Holt*, 166 F.3d 1156, 1157 (11th Cir. 1999). After review, the undersigned finds Plaintiff has not shown exceptional circumstances justifying appointment of counsel, *See Kilgo v. Ricks*, 983 F.2d 189, 193 (11th Cir. 1993); *Dean v. Barber*, 951 F.2d 1210, 1216 (11th Cir. 1992); *see also Fowler v. Jones*, 899 F.2d 1088, 1096 (11th Cir. 1990), and therefore, in exercising its discretion, the undersigned will deny Plaintiff's motion. Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion (Doc. 174) is DENIED.

Done, this 26th day of April 2022.

/s/ Charles S. Coody  
CHARLES S. COODY  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE